

REMARKS

In the Office Action that was mailed on November 19, 2003, claims 3-14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretschneider et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,807) ("Bretschneider"). The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-10, 12-14, and 16-17 are pending in the subject application, of which claims 12-14 and 17 are independent claims.

Amendments to the Claims:

The first storage unit of claim 17 is amended herein to recite a "bookmark" storage unit corresponding to bookmark data file 52. The second storage unit of claim 17 is amended herein to recite a "web page" storage unit corresponding to web page data file 53. Independent claims 12-14 and 17 are amended herein to recite that the browser is "not connected to the Internet" during the presentation of the web page information. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter.

Support for the amendments to claim 17 may be found in the Specification at page 12, lines 20-22 and at page 19, line 25 to page 20, line 2. Support for the amendments to claims 12-14 and 17 may be found in the Specification at page 10, lines 20-24.

Rejections of the Claims:

The examiner is correct in asserting that "any web page presented on a computer is first stored in memory of the computer." (Office Action, p. 6). However, in Bretschneider, the browser must be connected to the Internet during presentation of web pages in the kiosk mode slide show, i.e., although each web page is downloaded from the Internet and stored locally before display, the kiosk must maintain its connection to the Internet during the entire presentation. (Bretschneider, col. 9, line 64 – col. 10, line 9). In contrast, independent claims 12-14 and 17 (as amended) recite the presentation of the web page information while the browser is not connected to the Internet. Therefore, Bretschneider does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Miscellaneous:

The Applicants note the following errors in the Office Action. Although the Applicants recognize that the current examiner is newly-assigned to the subject application, the Applicants nevertheless respectfully request that the examiner exert extra care in the future to maintain the integrity of the record. Specifically,

- 1) the examiner checked both "This action is **FINAL**" and "This action is non-final" boxes on the Office Action Summary. The USPTO's PAIR system indicates that the Office Action is non-final;
- 2) the examiner listed claim 11 as pending and rejected on the Office Action Summary and in the Detailed Action. Claim 11 was previously canceled and is no longer pending in the subject application;
- 3) the examiner did not list his detailed reasons for rejecting dependent claims 3-5 and 10; and
- 4) the examiner never responded to the Applicants' argument on page 7 of the October 6, 2003 Amendment After Final Rejection that the June 5, 2003 Office Action was not properly made final.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that any immediately subsequent Office Action not be made final, because a clear issue has not been developed between the Applicants and the examiner, pursuant to MPEP § 706.07.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned

to attend to these matters. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2.18.2004

By: 

Matthew Q. Ammon
Registration No. 50,346

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-1500